

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
SPONSORED PROJECT INITIATION

Date: 2/13/80

Project Title: Conference on Victorian Studies

Project No: G-34-606

Co-Project Director: Sara M. Putzell and Annibel Jenkins

Sponsor: Committee for the Humanities in Georgia *misc*

Agreement Period: From 1/8/80 Until 5/30/80

Type Agreement: Grant No. CHG-80-044

Amount: \$1,000 (G-34-606)
1,865 (G-34-316 - Cost Sharing)
\$2,865 Total

Reports Required: Final Project Rpt; Final Financial Rpt

Sponsor Contact Person (s): C

Technical Matters

Anne Russell Mayeaux, PhD
Acting Executive Director
Committee for the Humanities in Ga
Georgia Center for Continuing Education
The University of GA
Athens, GA 30602
(404) 542-5481 GIST 241-5482

Contractual Matters
(thru OCA)

J. David Hall, Fiscal Officer
Committee for the Humanities in GA
Ga. Center for Continuing Ed.
UGA
Athens, GA 30602
(404) 542-1735 Gist 241-1736

Defense Priority Rating: n/a

Assigned to: English (School/Laboratory)

COPIES TO:

Project Director
Division Chief (EES)
School/Laboratory Director
Dean/Director-EES
Accounting Office
Procurement Office
Security Coordinator (OCA)
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

Library, Technical Reports Section
EES Information Office
EES Reports & Procedures
Project File (OCA)
Project Code (GTRI)
Other _____

2-2- N-
053 324

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
SPONSORED PROJECT TERMINATION

Date: 3/20/81

Project Title: Conference on Victorian Studies

Project No: G-34-606

Co-Project Director: Sara M. Putzell & Annibel Jenkins

Sponsor: Committee for the Humanities in Georgia

Effective Termination Date: 5/30/80

Clearance of Accounting Charges: _____

Grant/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:

NONE

- ☐ Final Invoice and Closing Documents
- ☐ Final Fiscal Report
- ☐ Final Report of Inventions
- ☐ Govt. Property Inventory & Related Certificate
- ☐ Classified Material Certificate
- ☐ Other _____

Assigned to: English (School/~~Laboratory~~)

COPIES TO:

Project Director
Division Chief (EES)
School/Laboratory Director
Dean/Director—EES
Accounting Office
Procurement Office
Security Coordinator (OCA)
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

Library, Technical Reports Section
EES Information Office
Project File (OCA)
Project Code (GTRI)
Other C.E. Smith

Suspense

A State-Based, Public Program for the Humanities in Georgia

COMMITTEE FOR THE HUMANITIES IN GEORGIA

MAIL TO:

Mr. J. Preston Prather, Executive Director
Committee for the Humanities in Georgia
Georgia Center for Continuing Education
The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
(Phone: 404-542-5481)

F I N A L P R O J E C T R E P O R T

(This report is due within 30 days of completion of the program)

1. PROJECT NUMBER: CHG-80-044 PROGRAM CATEGORY: A B X

PROJECT TITLE: Conference on Victorian Studies

SPONSORED BY: The Georgia Tech Research Institute

PROJECT DIRECTOR: *Name* Sara M. Putzell and Annibel Jenkins

Address English Dept., Georgia Institute of Technology

Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Phone (404) 894-2730 GIST

2. DATE PROJECT BEGAN: January 8, 1980

DATE PROJECT COMPLETED: June 30, 1980

DATE REPORT SUBMITTED: June 17, 1980

NOTE: Please type, using the space provided, if possible. If additional space is needed, additional pages may be added or the attached form may be retyped to provide the needed space. If you have any questions or need assistance, contact the Committee's staff at the address given above.

3. CO-SPONSORING ORGANIZATION(S): *As shown on the project proposal.*

4. PROFILE OF SPONSOR(S): List below the number of the various kinds of institutions, agencies, or groups involved in the program as sponsors and/or co-sponsors. (Do not include the cooperating organizations shown in item No. 5 below.)

<u> X </u> 4-year colleges/universities	<u> </u> Professional societies/associations
<u> </u> 2-year colleges	<u> </u> State/county/local government
<u> </u> Public/private school systems	<u> </u> Civic/community organizations
<u> </u> Libraries	<u> </u> Religious organizations
<u> </u> Museums	<u> </u> Media organizations
<u> </u> Historical societies	<u> </u> Other (list below)
<u> </u> Ad hoc humanities groups	<u>_____</u>
<u> </u> Business organizations/associations	<u>_____</u>
<u> </u> Labor/trade organizations	

5. COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS: List each institution, agency, or group, other than the sponsor(s) or co-sponsoring organization(s), which were directly involved in the program.

6. LOCATION OF PROJECT: List each community in which a program session was conducted and indicate the type of area (such as urban/rural, metropolitan, suburban) and the estimated population.

<u>Community or County</u>	<u>Type of Area</u>	<u>Population</u>
Atlanta	metropolitan	1,500,000

7. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

A. Total number in attendance at all sessions: 155

B. If the figure in "A" represents a cumulative total in which one person may be counted several times, please estimate as accurately as possible the actual number of individuals who attended the program.

60

C. Indicate below the estimated percentage of persons who attended the program from each of the following audience categories. Base your estimate on the group or category which each person seemed to represent while attending the program.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Attendance</u>
Civic/community organizations	<u> </u>
Business	<u> </u>
Professional societies/associations	<u>1%</u>
Labor	<u> </u>
Women's groups	<u> </u>
Men's groups	<u> </u>
Libraries/museums/historical societies	<u>5%</u>
Education	<u>84%</u>
Religious organizations	<u> </u>
Government	<u> </u>
Retired Persons	<u> </u>
Others (specify)	<u> </u>
<u> students</u>	<u>10%</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
TOTAL	<u>100%</u>

8. AUDIENCE BREAKDOWN:

- A. To the best of your ability, estimate below the breakdown of the audience (by percentage) according to sex, age, ethnic representation, and educational level.

<u>SEX</u>		<u>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</u>		<u>ETHNIC REPRESENTATION</u>	
Male:	<u>49</u> %	High School	<u>10</u> %	Caucasian	<u>96</u> %
Female:	<u>51</u> %	College	<u>5</u> %	Black	<u>3</u> %
		Graduate Work	<u>85</u> %	Hispanic	<u> </u> %
		Professional Training	<u> </u> %	Oriental	<u>1</u> %
<u>AGE</u>				Other (Identify)	<u> </u> %
Under 21	<u>10</u> %				
21-35	<u>18</u> %				
36-55	<u>72</u> %				
Over 55	<u> </u> %				

- B. To the best of your ability, assess the overall character of the audience (occupation, socio-economic status, etc.):

The audience was primarily academic humanists of middle class background.

9. MEDIA INVOLVEMENT (If applicable):

- A. Were the media (newspapers, TV, radio, etc.) involved in the promotion of the program? If so, how?

The program was announced in the Atlanta Journal/Constitution "Weekend" section and in Creative Loafing. Notices were sent to suburban papers and local radio stations.

- B. Were the media (newspapers, TV, radio, etc.) used in the conduct of the program to carry the program to the target audience and/or others? If so, how?

No

1. Estimate the number of people (in addition to those in actual attendance at the program) who were reached by media presentations of the program or parts of the program.

Number of Persons: n/a

2. If provision for telephone call-in was used in the program, please indicate below and estimate the number of calls received.

10. PROJECT STAFF INVOLVEMENT: *List all speakers and other resource persons, etc., involved in the project and give the information requested for each person. Use additional space if needed.*

	NAME	INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION	HUMANISTIC DISCIPLINE/OCCUPATION*	PROGRAM FUNCTION	NO. OF PROJECT HOURS
1.	Robert Detweiler	Emory Univ.	religion/lit.	planning chairman	5
2.	Karen Osborne	Stetson Univ.	literature	speaker	1½
3.	John L. Waltman	Auburn Univ.	literature	speaker	1½
4.	Peter J. McGuire	Georgia Tech	literature	speaker	1½
5.	Barbara Schnorrenberg		history	speaker	1½
6.	Fraser Harbutt	Emory Univ.	history	speaker	1½
7.	Linda Zatlin	Morehouse Col.	literature	planning chairman	7
8.	James T. Laney	Emory Univ.	theology	speaker	1½
9.	Leo Rauch	Ohio State	philosophy	speaker	1½
10.	Jerome Beaty	Emory Univ.	literature	speaker	1½

**List the specific disciplines represented by personnel affiliated with academic institutions (e.g., history, philosophy, literature, etc.).*

NOTE: *If there is any difference between the program personnel listed above and those listed on the Budget Estimate page of the original proposal, please explain below.*

10. PROJECT STAFF INVOLVEMENT (cont.):

	NAME	INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION	HUMANISTIC DISCIPLINE/OCCUPATION	PROGRAM FUNCTION	NO. OF PROJECT HOURS
11.	Robert McBath	Georgia State	history	speaker	2
12.	James F. Whitnel, sexton, Oakland Cemetary	Pres., Atlanta Chapter, Victorian Society in America		speaker	4
13.	Carole Silver	Yeshiva Univ.	literature vice-pres., North-east Victorian Studies Association	speaker planning	6
14.	Ward Hellstrom	Univ. Florida	literature editor, <u>Victorian Newsletter</u>	speaker	2
15.	Ann Abrams	Spelman College	art history	chairman planning	3 1/2
16.	Eileen Segrist		president, Atlanta Preservation Center	speaker	1 1/2
17.	Michelle Bogart	Univ. Georgia	art history	speaker	1 1/2
18.	Kathryn M. Hunter	Morehouse College	literature	speaker	1 1/2
19.	Benjamin S. Lawson	Albany State College	literature	speaker	1 1/2
20.	Daniel Bjork	Univ. Alabama Birmingham	history	speaker	1 1/2
21.	Annibel Jenkins	Georgia Tech	literature	project director	36 1/2
22.	Sara M. Putzell	Georgia Tech	literature	project director	75 1/2

11. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

A. *Briefly evaluate the project concerning the following:*

1. *The project's success or failure in meeting its specific objectives as stated in the project proposal. Include your observations concerning the reasons for success or failure regarding specific objectives.*

Audience response indicates the objective of increasing awareness of Victorian American and British art, ideas, and values was met. Audience reports consistently praised the interdisciplinary aspect of the conference as "good for exchange--very much needed in this period." An art professor said, for example, that it "broadened my concept of the varieties of 19th-century studies," while an historian found the "interdisciplinary nature of the papers most stimulating, as was the awareness shown in many of them of cross-cultural currents."

2. *The project's success or failure in reaching the target audience. Include your observations concerning the reasons for the success or failure.*

Given the late date in the academic year at which it became possible to publicize the conference, it had good success in reaching the target audience of southeastern academic humanists. Letters received prior to the conference indicated that many more were interested and willing to come to a 1981 conference for which they can plan in advance and secure departmental travel funds. Community attendance was slight, perhaps due to conflicts with other community events. Meetings with groups might help.

B. *Briefly summarize the target audience's reaction to and evaluation of the project.*

The reaction and evaluation was overwhelmingly favorable, to the extent that the audience unanimously requested that a similar, longer conference be held in the spring of 1981. Between sessions, there was serious discussion of ideas among audience members and speakers. The audience repeatedly expressed appreciation of the interdisciplinary nature of the program and stated that they had learned important, new material from speakers in their own and other humanistic disciplines.

C. *Indicate any significant participation in the project by community leaders, citizens, representatives of government, and/or representatives of public and private agencies.*

James Whitnel, President of the Atlanta Chapter of the Victorian Society in American and assistant sexton of Oakland Cemetery, addressed the audience on the wealth of Victoriana to be found in Georgia and encouraged cooperative study between the society and academic humanists, thus introducing many of them to a new area of study. Eileen Segrist, head of the Atlanta Preservation Center, gave a slide presentation of Victorian Atlanta and called for support of future restoration and preservation projects.

12. HUMANISTIC CONTENT (as assessed by the Project Director): *This section must be completed by the Project Director on the basis of his or her personal observations and the results of the audience's evaluation. The space provided should generally be sufficient, but use additional space as needed.*

- A. *Using specific examples, indicate how the humanists in the program used the insights and resources of their disciplines to increase the audience's understanding of the topics or issues being discussed.*

Each humanist used his research in his primary discipline as a basis for his presentation. Historians gave papers on Victorian social life and Anglo-American economic and political relations. A theologian analyzed changing views of human nature, and a philosopher analyzed conflicting interpretations of Mill's Utilitarianism. Literary critics described Romantic elements in Victorian literature and introduced the audience to American civil war novels. The social impact of 19th-century art was

- B. *On the basis of the audience's evaluation, discuss the effectiveness or lack also of effectiveness of the humanists in generating increased public awareness consid- and appreciation of the humanities. Give specific examples. ered.*

The audience evaluated them as very effective. In particular, they praised the introduction to political ideas of the time; Ward Hellstrom's discussion of the state of Victorian studies, including the needs and tools for further research; Jerome Beaty's wide-ranging analysis of changing ideas and values; and the philosophical context for Victorian study provided by James Laney and Leo Rauch. All papers were judged valuable; only a couple were felt to be somewhat narrow in focus.

- C. *Using specific examples, evaluate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of each humanistic discipline as a resource for increasing the audience's understanding of the topics or issues under discussion.*

The program drew on several disciplines, so that literature people said that they learned much that was new to them from the historians, art historians, and philosophers. Members of these disciplines likewise felt that they had learned from others. All seemed to feel that they had gained a richer context for their own studies and teaching.

- D. *In two or three sentences, indicate your assessment of the overall humanistic content and import of the program.*

The humanistic content was excellent, comprising not only new information and original research, but also fresh perspectives on familiar material. The overall impact of the program, as expressed by the audience, was to increase knowledge of the Victorian period and, perhaps more importantly, to increase interest in interdisciplinary studies and teaching as well as to encourage participation in community efforts to preserve Victorian buildings.

13. HUMANISTIC CONTENT (as assessed by the Humanist Evaluator):* This section must be completed by the humanist(s) evaluating the program under the provisions of Guidelines 4 and 7. This page must be signed and returned with the Final Project Report. The space provided will generally be sufficient, but use additional space as needed.

- A. Evaluate the performance of the humanists in the program in relation to (1) their effectiveness in relating the humanities to the topics or issues under discussion and (2) their effectiveness in relating the insights and/or content of the humanities to the audience. Give specific examples.

Humanists' relation of their disciplines to the topics was excellent, and their ability to communicate to the audience ranged from very good to excellent. Each addressed an issue related to his own discipline; for example, philosopher Leo Rauch analyzed responses to Mill's utilitarianism, and historian Fraser Harbutt analyzed Anglo-American political relations. Clarity of presentation made the addresses quite effective.

- B. Using specific examples, evaluate the effectiveness of each humanistic discipline as a resource in the program.

Because each speaker drew on his own discipline and well as others, the disciplinary input was strong and effective. For example, James Laney's theological studies made possible a comprehensive analysis of nineteenth-century concepts of selfhood, and Schnorrenberg's historical studies gave scope to her description of American women's response to the British.

- C. Indicate and evaluate some of the ways in which the humanists used illustrations, examples, and/or concepts drawn from their disciplines to clarify the topics or issues under discussion.

Jerome Beaty (literature) drew on a range of characters and scenes from Victorian literature to illustrate changing views; Kathryn Hunter (literature) used slides of Thomas Nash's cartoons to discuss his satire; Daniel Bjork (history) quoted letters, memoirs, and primary texts to indicate the importance of Hugo Münsterberg to American intellectual history.

- D. In two or three sentences, assess the overall humanistic content and import of the program. If possible, give specific examples and illustrations.

This conference has considerable importance as having stimulated interdisciplinary study of the nineteenth century, especially the southeastern United States. Participants expressed interest in further meetings of this kind and a commitment to pursuing scholarly research in areas brought up at the meeting. Jerome Beaty has been encouraged by the audience, for example, to expand and publish his address into a major article.


Signature of Humanist Evaluator

literature
Discipline

Georgia Institute of Technology
Institution

*Note to the Project Director: The person completing and signing this portion of the report (Item 13) must be an academic humanist as defined in the Committee's guidelines for grant applications.

14. IMPACT OF THE PROJECT:

- A. *Briefly discuss the ways in which the project benefited the community and indicate whether there will be any continuing community benefits.*

It benefited the community by increasing academic humanists' awareness of work in other disciplines, thus adding to their capacities for further research and teaching, and by increasing awareness of the need for restoration and preservation of Victorian art and architecture in Georgia.

- B. *Indicate whether the program itself will continue beyond the period of humanities funding. If so, under what sponsorship or support?*

The audience and participants expressed strong interest in attending a similar, two-day conference next year. President Laney has offered Emory University as a site for the proposed conference; in addition, Robert Detweiler, Director of the Institute of the Liberal Arts at Emory, has agreed to co-direct. Only funding for major speakers and public-

- C. *Discuss the feasibility of future replication of the project in other areas.*
ity is thus required.

The project can be easily replicated. Because of their historic architecture and the local campuses, Savannah and Athens seem particularly appropriate.

15. **PROJECT MATERIALS:** *Describe the materials produced for the project (e.g., films, tapes, etc.) and indicate whether copies are available for dissemination. Two copies of any "product" forthcoming from a project (such as publications of proceedings, tapes, films, etc.) must be forwarded with this report to the Committee for the Humanities in Georgia for its archives. Also, include copies of brochures, hand-outs, and other such materials with this report.*

No physical products have been produced, although the editor of the Bucknell Review has expressed interest in the papers. If any of these are published, copies will be sent to the Committee. Copies of the call for papers, program, and audience evaluation form are included with this report.

16. **FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT:** *The FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT form on the following page will be recorded and forwarded to the Committee's Fiscal Officer, who will arrange for the audit of the program upon notification that this Final Project Report has been received. The completed and signed Final Financial Report must accompany this Final Project Report.*

THIS FINAL PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED BY _____

Signature of Project Director

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT
GEORGIA COMMITTEE FOR THE HUMANITIES

Grantee: Georgia Institute of TechnologyGrant Number: CHG-80-044Address: Atlanta, Georgia 30332Project Name: Conference onVictorian StudiesPhone: 404/894-4624Amount of Grant: \$ 1,200.00

EXPENDITURES

BUDGET CATEGORY	Federal	In-Kind Match	Cash Match	Total
Salaries		\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00
Staff Benefits		105.10		105.10
Humanist Honoraria				
Consultant	\$ 400.00			400.00
Travel	453.63			453.63
Office Supplies				
Instructional Materials				
Equipment and Space Rental				
Printing and Postage	260.81			260.81
Other (Specify) Overhead @ 76%		760.00		760.00
Total	1,114.44	1,865.10		2,979.54

Submit an original and one copy.

Certification: I certify the above data are correct, based on official accounting system and records, consistently applied and maintained, and that expenditures shown have been made for the purpose of and in accordance with, applicable grant terms and conditions, and that appropriate documentation to support these costs and expenditures is available upon request.

Project Director _____

Dr. Sara M. Putzell Signature

Financial Officer _____

David V. Welch Signature

Associate Professor
Georgia Institute of
Technology

6/25/80

Manager, Title

Date

Grants & Contracts Acctg.

6/25/80

Title

Date

For State Agency Use Only:

Approved By: _____

Signature

Title

Date

Comments _____